

**REMARKS**

Initially, the Applicants would like to express their appreciation to Examiner Prasad for the courtesies extended to the Applicants' attorney during a telephone interview on August 12, 2003. During the telephone interview, which involved a discussion of draft versions of amended claims and new claims, Examiner Prasad stated that a new search was needed because the currently amended claim 1 introduces new issues that require additional consideration. His initial search had not included a search for a circuit card pack connected to a backplane (even though there was support for this configuration in the specification). Also, Examiner Prasad would have to do a search based on the new claims 6 and 7.

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request additional consideration and review of the claims in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

**Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,565). Also, the Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt et al. in view of Boyer (US patent 3,755,630). Applicants respectfully submit that even if it were obvious to combine Schmitt and Boyer in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the resulting combination would not embody Applicants' inventive teachings nor anticipate Applicants' claims.

An important aspect of Applicants' invention is a combination of connected parts that include a circuit card package with an inserted parent circuit card. The parent circuit card is connected to an interface adapter board via a card edge connector on the parent circuit card. The interface adapter board allows the insertion of one or more child circuit cards into other card edge connectors mounted directly on the interface adapter board, and for electrical conductivity

between the parent and child circuit cards. The parent circuit card has a leading edge and the leading edge extends beyond the connection between the interface adapter board and the parent circuit card. The parent circuit card's leading edge is inserted into a backplane connector mounted on a backplane. This aspect of the invention is pointed out at lines 22-32 on page 2, and lines 5-18 on page 3 of Applicants' specification, and in Applicants' independent claim 1.

The Examiner states that Schmitt shows a circuit card package with a first circuit card with a first card edge connector connected to an interface card adapter. However, there is nothing in Schmitt that shows or suggests that Schmitt's first circuit card's leading edge extends beyond the connection between the interface adapter board and the first circuit card, and is inserted into a backplane connector mounted on a backplane. Also, Schmitt makes no mention that its interface adapter board provides electrical conductivity between the first circuit card and child circuit cards as done in Applicants' invention.

Whether or not it would have been obvious to combine Schmitt with Boyer in the manner suggested in the Office Action, it is submitted that each of these claims is allowable at least for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-4.

#### Claim Amendment

Claims 1-4 have been amended to more clearly and particularly point out that which Applicants regard as the invention and to improve their form generally. It is submitted that the amendments made do not narrow the scope of the claimed subject matter in any way.

#### New Claims

New claims 6 and 7 have been added. These claims include limitations directed to the above-described distinguishing aspects of the invention and are submitted to be patentable for the reasons stated hereinabove.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, as well as new claims 6 and 7 are in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues that the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve the issues.

Respectfully submitted,  
Everardo Correa

By James Milton  
James Milton, Attorney  
Reg. No. 46935  
(732) 949-7365

Date: 8/18/03

Atts.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope with sufficient postage addressed to: Mail Stop RCE,  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Aug. 18, 2003.

Tamika R. Gatson  
Tamika R. Gatson

Date 8/18/03